

REMARKS

At the time of the Office Action dated November 5, 2003, claims 2-6, 13 and 16-18 were pending in this application. Of those claims, claims 2-4, 13 and 16-18 have been rejected. Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the Examiner's allowance of claims 5 and 6. Independent claims 2-3, 13 and 16-17 have each been amended to recite the exposure for forming unevenness on the interlayer film is conducted only from a front side. Applicants submit that the present Amendment does not generate any new matter issue.

CLAIMS 13 AND 17 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS BASED UPON TSUDA ET AL., U.S. PATENT No. 6,262,783 (HEREINAFTER TSUDA) IN VIEW OF SHIMADA ET AL. U.S. PATENT No. 6,052,162 (HEREINAFTER SHIMADA)

On pages three through five of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Shimada discloses a liquid crystal display having an interlayer insulating film 38 composed of a positive-type resin having a sensitivity to an i-line of 365 nm in wavelength and a h-line of 405 nm in wavelength. The Examiner then concluded that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Tsuda in view of Shimada to include the positive type resin to improve the display brightness. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicants note that independent claim 13 has been amended to recite that the unevenness on the interlayer insulating film is formed by exposure only from a front side. According to the claimed invention, the semiconductor film is formed in the picture element region (under the interlayer insulating film). Therefore, if the exposure is conducted from

backside, as is taught by Tsuda, at the time of forming unevenness on the interlayer insulating film, no UV light is transmitted into the interlayer insulating film. As a result, any unevenness cannot be formed on the interlayer insulating film.

As discussed above, the exposure is conducted, not from backside, but only from front side in the claimed invention. Therefore, the above-discussed problems do not arise, and the unevenness can be successfully formed on the interlayer insulating film. Furthermore, at the time of exposure, the substrate backside is not subject to the light reflected from the substrate holder. An advantage results from the interlayer insulating film, which is a photosensitive resin, being prevented from photosensitizing. Thus, an exact exposure can be assured. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that the claimed structure resulting from the exposure only from the front side, according to the claimed invention, is neither taught nor suggested by Tsuda in view of Shimada.

Independent claim 17 has also been amended to introduce the concept that the exposure for forming unevenness on the interlayer film is conducted only from a front side. As discussed above, the combination of Tsuda in view of Shimada fails to teach or suggest this particular limitation. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the imposed rejection of claims 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Tsuda in view of Shimada.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Tsuda in view of Shimada and further in view Kiryu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,368,962 (hereinafter Kiryu)

On pages six through eight of the Office Action, The Examiner then concluded that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Tsuda and Kiryu in view of Shimada to include a positive type resin to improve the display brightness. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 16 has also been amended to introduce the concept that the exposure for forming unevenness on the interlayer film is conducted only from a front side. As discussed above, the combination of Tsuda in view of Shimada fails to teach or suggest this particular limitation. The claimed invention includes a process of sticking an UV-cut film on a backside of the transparent insulating substrate to which a photosensitive resin is applied. Since the UV-cut film is provided on the backside of the substrate, even if one were to attempt to conduct exposure from a backside, as taught by Tsuda, no UV light is transmitted into the interlayer insulating film, and thus, exposure cannot be conducted. Also, the Examiner's tertiary reference of Kiryu does not cure the deficiencies of Tsuda and Shimada. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the imposed rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Tsuda in view of Shimada and Kiryu.

**Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness predicated upon
Tsuda in view of Shimada and further in view of Takatsu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,434,026
(hereinafter Takatsu)**

On pages eight through ten of the Office Action, the Examiner concluded that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the methodology and mask of Tsuda in view of Shimada and Takatsu to arrive at the claimed invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 2 has also been amended to introduce the concept that the exposure for forming unevenness on the interlayer film is conducted only from a front side. As discussed above, the combination of Tsuda in view of Shimada fails to teach or suggest this particular limitation. Also, the Examiner's tertiary reference of Takatsu does not cure the deficiencies of Tsuda and Shimada. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the imposed rejection of claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Tsuda in view of Shimada and Takatsu.

**Claims 3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon
Tsuda in view of Shimada and Kiryu**

On pages ten through eleven of the Office Action, The Examiner then concluded that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Tsuda and Kiryu in view of Shimada to include a positive type resin to improve the display brightness. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 3 has also been amended to introduce the concept that the exposure for forming unevenness on the interlayer film is conducted only from a front side. As discussed above, the combination of Tsuda in view of Shimada fails to teach or suggest this particular limitation. Also, the Examiner's tertiary reference of Kiryu does not cure the deficiencies of Tsuda and Shimada. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the imposed rejection of claims 3 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Tsuda in view of Shimada and Kiryu.

Applicants have made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. However, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. Accordingly, and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

Application No.: 09/512,107

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY



Scott D. Paul
Registration No. 42,984

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000 SDP/SAB:kap
Date: February 5, 2004
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087